

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 18 are amended to distinguish over JP '546, claim 21 is added, and claim 11 is amended to address the objection thereto.

No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to claim 1 can be found in original claim 8. Support for the language added to claim 18 can be found throughout the specification at, for example, paragraphs 40, 43 and 46. Support for new claim 21 can be found in original claim 1 and throughout the specification at, for example, paragraphs 40, 43 and 46.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 2, 6, 7, 8, 11-14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are allowable. To this end, allowable claim 8 has been incorporated into claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

II. Claim Objection

Claim 11 was objected to because of an alleged informality. In particular, the Patent Office alleges that the term "distal end" is unclear because it is not defined which end of the shield is distal. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the term "distal end" was clear in view of the specification and drawings. However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 11 to eliminate the term "distal," the apparent source of confusion for the Patent Office. An end of the shield being bent toward the oiling roller is clearly described in paragraph 51 of the specification, feature 45 of Fig. 3 and feature 450 of Fig. 4.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

III. **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by JP 2002-283546 ("JP '546"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained above, allowable claim 8 has been incorporated into claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10 and 15 are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 18 now recites that the shield is a static shield. JP '546 does not teach or suggest that sheet 5c is a static sheet. In fact, there is no need for the device of JP '546 to include a static shield. JP '546 is directed to an ink jet device, and thus forms an image by jetting an ink onto member 2. The ink is not transferred electrostatically, and is not charged. In contrast, a static shield is required in the present application to prevent build up of electrostatic charge such as used in xerographic image formation. See paragraphs 40 and 42 of the specification. This feature is not necessary in the device of JP '546 as electrostatic charge is not problematic in a conventional ink jet device.

New claim 21 recites the features recited in original claim 1 and additionally that the shield is a static shield. As explained above, JP '546 clearly does not teach or suggest that sheet 5c is a static sheet.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that JP '546 does not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 15, 18 and 21. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are thus respectfully requested.

IV. **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 and 9-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/hs

Date: August 2, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--